T-426 P.01/04 F-905

## RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 1 2 2004

## <u>DRAFT – DO NOT ENTER</u>

## CARDINAL LAW GROUPOFFICIAL

1603 Orrington Avenue/Suite 2000 Evanston, Illinois 60201 Telephone 847 – 905 - 7111 Facsimile 847 – 905 – 7113

Date:

JULY 12, 2004

To:

**EXAMINER PANNALA** 

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Fax #:

(703) 746-7758

From:

FRANK C. NICHOLAS

Phone #:

(847) 424-2521

Client/Matter No.:

AUS920010765US1 (9000/75)

# of Pages:

4

(including cover sheet)

IF YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS MESSAGE, PLEASE CALL 847/905-7111, Ext. 112 AND ASK FOR JENNIFER CRUZ.

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED. IT MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT, OR TRADE SECRET INFORMATION WHICH IS EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAWS. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR AN EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION. DISTRIBUTION. OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE (AND ALL COPIES) TO US BY MAIL AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS. WE WILL REIMBURSE YOU FOR POSTAGE.

ATTENTION: PLEASE DO NOT ENTER THIS DOCUMENT INTO THE FILE HISTORY OF THE PENDING APPLICATION.

**PATENT** 

T-426 P.02/04 F-905

Case No. AUS920010765US1 (9000/75)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of:	)	
VIKTORS BERSTIS	) Examiner: PANNALA, S.	R.
Serial No.: 09/997,916	)	
Filed: NOVEMBER 29, 2001	) Group Art Unit: 2177 )	
Title: FILE MAINTENANCE ON A COMPUTER GRID	)	

## AGENDA OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FOR JULY 13, 2004 AT 2:00 PM EST

Dear Sir:

The following is an agenda of the issues the Applicant would like addressed on the telephone interview scheduled for July 13, 2004 at 2:00 PM EST regarding the First Non-Final Office Action mailed on April 26, 2004:

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-12, 16-17, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Brien et al. (US Patent 6,351,776) in view of Millard (US Patent 6,122,738).

In reference to independent claims 1 and 11, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion that O'Brien teaches the claimed step of "determining a usage profile of the member" wherein the client may request an access to the X-drive which is an Internet hard drive (Fig. 1, col. 7, lines 5-24). A hard drive request as disclosed by O'Brien may lead to a determination that the client computer is actively being used at that instant. O'Brien, however, is silent as to how this request may lead to a determination of an overall usage profile. It is simply not possible to determine times of

computer inactivity using simply the disclosure of O'Brien, which is a necessary component for determining a usage profile. The maintenance functions of the present invention are performed based on the usage profile. Without knowing when the client computer is inactive, many of the maintenance functions may not operate properly and/or may conflict with active use of the computer (i.e., an ongoing file archive function may deprive vital computer resources from the user while he/she accessed the computer at the same time).

In reference to independent claims 1 and 11, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion that O'Brien teaches the claimed step of "performing a maintenance function based on the database" wherein the database is archived in order to access alternate database (Fig. 2, col. 9, lines 29-33). O'Brien discloses that the database object 236, which is <u>not</u> a database in and of itself but more like a file, determines the database operation to be performed and/or to which database to send operations based on the type of request it receives (Fig. 2, col. 9, lines 33-42). The requests originate from a client at the command of users (Fig. 1, col. 7, lines 9-11). As such, the maintenance function is based on user requests and <u>not</u> on a database itself as is recited in claims 1 and 11.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness (1) the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claimed limitations; and (2) there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings—the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must both be found in the prior art and not based on the applicant's disclosure. The Applicant asserts that O'Brien fails to disclose at least two limitations of claims 1 and 11. In addition, both the O'Brien and Millard patents fail to disclose, teach, or suggest their combination to arrive at the invention as recited in claims 1 and 11. Thus, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be established against independent claims 1 and 11 due to a failure to meet the two conditions. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2-10 and 11-20 depend from independent claims 1 and 11, respectively, and therefore include each and every limitation of claims 1 and 11. Therefore, claims 2-10 and 11-20 should be allowed for at least the same reasons provided for claims 1 and 11. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to claims 2-10 and 11-20 is therefore respectfully requested.

PTOL-413A (08-03)
Approved for use thirough 07/31/2006, OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patenti and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form						
Application No. 2919 Examiner: Panyala	197916First	Named Applicant:	Viktors B Status of App	e <i>rstis</i> lication: 15+	oA	
Tentative Participants	: holas	(2)		<b>-</b>		
(3)	_	_ (4)		<del></del>		
Proposed Date of Interview: 7 13 2004 Proposed Time: 2:00 (AMPM)  Type of Interview Requested: (1) M Telephonic (2) [ ] Personal (3) [ ] Video Conference						
If yes, provide brief d	escription:			,	-	
Issues To Be Discussed						
Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art O'Brien 6,3	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed	
(1) Rej - 1036a)	1411	Millard 6,1	:51,776 <u>2</u> 2,798 [ ]	[]	[]	
(2)			_ []	[]	[]	
(3)			_ []	[]	[]	
(4)			_ []	[]	[]	
[ ] Continuation Shee	t Attached	<del></del>				
Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:  O'Brien fairs to disclose at least two limitations of indep.  Claims I and II. Further, O'Brien and Millard fail to  disclose teach or suggest their combination to arrive at  Claims I and An interview was conducted on the above identified application on						
NOTE: This form should be co § 713.01). This application will no interview. Therefore, as soon as possible.	ot be delayed frapelicant is adv	om issue because of a	applicant's failure to su at of the substance of t	ubmit a written this interview (3	record of this	
(Applicant/Applicant	s Representativ	ve Signature)	(Examiner/SPE Sign	aturė)		

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is comment to obtain or rutain a beautic by the public which is so the jund by the USFTO to process) an application. Confidentially is governed by 35 U.S.C. 123 and 37 CFR 1.14. The collection is estimated to take 21 minutes so complete, unstabling pathering, and substituting the completed applications form to USFTO. Time will very depending upon the individual case. Any comments including gathering, preparing, and substituting the descriptions for red ording this burston chould be seen to the Charl Information Offices U.S. Passet and Tradesparts Office, U.S. Department of Comments, F.O. But 1450, Alexandria, V.A. 22413-1450. DO NOT SEND FREE OR COMPLETED PORMS TO THIS and Tradesparts Office, U.S. Department of Comments, F.O. But 1450, Alexandria, V.A. 22413-1450.

ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Petens, P.O. But 1450, Alexandria, V.A. 22413-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.